Oleksandr PISKUNOV,
orcid.org/0000-0002-7176-7423
Candidate of Philology, PhD,
Associate Professor at the Department of Germanic and Slavonic Linguistics
Donbas State Teachers' Training University
(Dnipro, Ukraine) piskunov.oleksandr@gmail.com

Viktoriia ROMAN,
orcid.org/0000-0003-3468-1062
Candidate of Philology, PhD,
Associate Professor at the Department of Germanic and Slavonic Linguistics
Donbas State Teachers' Training University
(Dnipro, Ukraine) roman.victoriya2016@gmail.com

BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE AS A DETERMIN
ANT OF TRANSLATION ACTIONS

The article studies the current issues of translating realias that are an integral part of cultural heritage and national identity. This work is devoted to the problem of translating realias in literary discourse. The authors consider realias as lexical units to denote objects and phenomena characteristic of the life, way of life and culture of a certain people and absent in other cultures. The authors emphasize the multifunctionality of realias within a work of fiction. It is emphasized that realias are carriers of national and historical flavor and usually do not have exact equivalents in other languages. The authors examine the main difficulties faced by translators in trying to accurately and adequately convey the content and meaning of realias from one language to another. The article analyzes various approaches and methods of classifying realias proposed by leading Ukrainian and foreign translation scholars.

Particular attention is paid to the question of translation, in particular, the problem of adequate transmission of cultural features and historical context across the linguistic barrier. The authors of the article consider the influence of socio-cultural differences on the process of interlingual communication, as well as the need for cultural adaptation of the text to ensure maximum understanding by the recipient audience. Considerable attention is paid to the pragmatic aspect of translating realias.

The authors emphasize the need for pragmatic adaptation of the translation text, taking into account the background knowledge, socio-psychological characteristics and cultural environment of the target audience. At the same time, the importance of preserving the national originality of the original is emphasized; the choice of a particular translation method depends on many factors, including the function of the reality in the text and the overall translation strategy. Particular attention is paid to the concept of «background knowledge» in the context of translation, which determines the general knowledge of the participants in communication and is necessary for successful interpretation of the text. It is noted that effective translation requires not only knowledge of the language but also a deep understanding of the cultural context in which the original text was created.

In general, the study demonstrates the complexity and multidimensionality of the problem of translating realias in literary discourse. The authors conclude that there is a significant set of translation techniques for conveying realias, and this problem cannot be considered completely solved, since not every case has a ready-made translation equivalent. Further study of this issue is of significant theoretical and practical interest to translation studies.

Key words: *realia, translation, literary discourse, national identity, pragmatic factor, pragmatic adaptation, socio-cultural differences, background knowledge.*

Олександр ПІСКУНОВ,
orcid.org/0000-0002-7176-7423
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри германської та слов'янської філології
Донбаського державного педагогічного університету
(Дніпро, Україна) piskunov.oleksandr@gmail.com

Вікторія РОМАН,
orcid.org/0000-0003-3468-1062
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри германської та слов'янської філології
Донбаського державного педагогічного університету
(Дніпро, Україна) roman.victoriya2016@gmail.com

ФОНОВІ ЗНАННЯ ЯК ДЕТЕРМІНАНТ ПЕРЕКЛАДАЦЬКИХ ДІЙ

Стаття досліджує актуальні питання перекладу реалій, які є невід'ємною частиною культурної спадщини та національної ідентичності. Автори розглядають реалії як лексичні одиниці, що позначають предмети та явища, характерні для життя, побуту та культури певного народу і відсутні в інших культурах. Зазначається поліфункціональність реалій у рамках художнього твору. Підкреслюється, що реалії є носіями національного та історичного колориту і зазвичай не мають точних еквівалентів в інших мовах. Автори досліджують основні труднощі, з якими стикаються перекладачі у спробах точно та адекватно передати вміст і значення реалій з однієї мови на іншу. В статті проаналізовано різні підходи та методи класифікації реалій, запропоновані у роботах провідних українських та зарубіжних перекладознавців.

Особлива увага приділяється практичним аспектам перекладу, зокрема, проблемі адекватності передачі культурних особливостей та історичного контексту через мовний бар'єр. Автори статті розглядають вплив соціокультурних відмінностей на процес міжмовної комунікації, а також необхідність культурної адаптації тексту для забезпечення максимального розуміння аудиторією-реципієнтом. Значна увага приділяється прагматичному аспекту перекладу реалій. Автори зазначають необхідність прагматичної адаптації тексту перекладу з урахуванням фонових знань, соціально-психологічних характеристик та культурного середовища цільової аудиторії. При цьому наголошується на важливості збереження національної своєрідності оригіналу, вибір певного способу перекладу залежить від багатьох факторів, зокрема від функції реалії в тексті та загальної стратегії перекладу. Окрема увага приділяється поняттю «фонових знань» у контексті перекладу, які визначають загальні знання учасників комунікації і необхідні для успішної інтерпретації тексту. Зазначається, що ефективний переклад вимагає від перекладача не лише знання мови, але й глибокого розуміння культурного контексту, у якому створений оригінал тексту.

Загалом, дослідження демонструє складність та багатоаспектність проблеми перекладу реалій у художньому дискурсі. Автори дійшли висновку, що існує значний набір перекладацьких прийомів для передачі реалій, ця проблема не може вважатися остаточно вирішеною, оскільки не для кожного випадку існує готовий перекладацький еквівалент. Подальше вивчення цього питання представляє суттєвий теоретичний та практичний інтерес для перекладознавства.

Ключові слова: реалії, переклад, художній дискурс, національна ідентичність, прагматичний фактор, прагматична адаптація, соціокультурні відмінності, фонові знання.

Formulation of the problem. Language as a social phenomenon is considered to be one of the distinctive features of modern linguistics. It is obvious that a complete understanding and careful study of linguistic phenomena is possible only by taking into account both linguistic and non-linguistic factors in their full extent and diversity. Consequently, it cannot be denied that the modern linguistic theory of translation considers translation as a special form of interlanguage communication in the whole set of linguistic and extralinguistic factors.

In modern linguistics, the question of the methods of translating realias remains open, as there are certain difficulties that translators face when translating a particular object. The translation of realias is one of the most important issues in translation studies today and at the same time is part of the problem of conveying the cultural identity of a people through language.

The problem of translating realia has both theoretical and great practical significance. The amount of literary works translated into foreign languages is constantly increasing. Taking into account the great value of scientific works and their translations, it is obvious that the translation of words and expressions characteristic of a certain people is of great interest. **Degree of Problem Elaboration.** For more than half a century, realias have been the subject of detailed consideration in translation studies. The problems of defining the

concept of «realias» and the general classification of ways of translating them have been raised in the works of Ukrainian and foreign translation scholars such as V. Demetska (Demetska V., 2008), O. Oguy (Oguy O., 2003), O. Rebriy (Rebriy O., 2019), O. Selivanova (Selivanova O., 2010), R. Zorivchak (Zorivchak R., 1989), V. Karaban (Karaban V., 2003), P. Bekh (Bekh P., 2005), A. Newbert (Newbert A., 1999), E. Naida (Naida E., 1975), etc. In the works on translation theory, attempts have been made to classify realias according to certain features. The question of how to convey realias within the framework of a more global pragmatic problem, namely, the problem of preserving the national and historical colour of the translated work of art, is also considered. This position determines **the relevance of our work**, since the study of the problem of reproducing realias in literary discourse is not sufficiently complete and well-founded and requires further research in the field of translation studies. **The purpose of our study** is to determine the peculiarities of reproducing the ways of realias in a literary discourse. In order to achieve this goal, **the following tasks have been set**: to determine the significance of realias in creating the cultural background of a work of fiction and to study the influence of the pragmatic aspect on the choice of the way of translating realias.

Presentation of main material of the research. Any two languages that differ in their historical, geographical, and cultural backgrounds have elements in their language systems that cannot be compared. In this regard, researchers speak of a linguistic picture of the world, which is formed by a person through thinking in a particular language. It appears as a part of the conceptual picture of the human world, which is «tied» to the language and reflected through linguistic forms. Languages are known to differ from each other not only in their vocabulary and grammar, but also in relation that each of them divides realia into its own way, creates its own «world picture». Therefore, in the process of translation, both the interaction of two languages and the interaction of two cultures, two different «world views» take place.

When considering translation as an act of bilingual communication, the works on translation theory point out that one should take into account the differences in the cultures of its participants, especially since the languages that come into contact in translation are themselves carriers of national cultures. Speaking about translation in the aspect of intercultural communication, T. Havryliv points out that it is not only the contact of two semantic systems with their national and cultural properties, but also the contact of representatives of two linguistic and cultural communities, each with its own worldview and a certain store of cultural heritage: background knowledge, language etiquette, moral and aesthetic norms, etc. (Havryliv T., 2005: 130). The communicators involved in interlingual communication speak different languages, but they also have different background knowledge, different social and historical experiences, and belong to different cultures. One of the features of E. Naida's concept is its focus on cultural and ethnic aspects of translation. To have the desired pragmatic impact, one should take into account the socio-cultural differences reflected in the language and the peculiarities of the background knowledge of the receptors, which determine the correct interpretation and evaluation of the transmitted information. In his works, E. Naida suggests that the necessary impact on receptors of this kind can only be ensured if the translation text does not contain cultural facts unfamiliar to the target language or images or associations based on these facts. This implies the need for significant cultural adaptation of the text during translation (Naida E., 1975: 130–140).

The problem of compensating for the loss of information that may occur during the transfer of realias (as lexical items denoting phenomena that are absent in the culture of the target language) is closely related to one of the most important categories of pragmatics – the pragmatic factor, which reflects the totality of background (knowledge and the different socio-cultural experience of native speakers (Korunets I., 2008: 19–33). Translation makes significant contribution to the pragmatic aspects of the source text. As a result, many things that are clear and obvious to native speakers turn out to be incomprehensible or even unintelligible. Undoubtedly, a translator cannot but take this into account in his or her work. Thus, one of the determinants of translation actions at the stage of creating a translation text is the focus on the recipient of the translation, his or her background knowledge, socio-psychological characteristics and cultural environment.

The notion of «background knowledge» in linguistics has been discussed in detail in the works of I. Haman (Haman I., 2019: 85–87), S. Zasekin (Zasekin S., 2012), R. Zorivchak (Zorivchak R., 1989), O. Selivanova (Selivanova O., 2010). In our work, background knowledge is defined as «knowledge common to the participants of a communicative act». In other words, it is the information common to communicators to ensure mutual understanding during communication. Neither background knowledge, as a more general category, nor background information is something that is once and for all established. Some of it may be lost over time as it becomes irrelevant and

is not used, but in general, background information tends to be constantly expanding due to growing contacts between peoples and their cultures (Korunets I., 2008: 51–57). For the theory and practice of translation, only that part of the background knowledge relating to phenomena specific to another culture, another country, and that is necessary for the readers of the translated work to understand its content without loss of detail, is actually important. The realias of the language culture, i. e., elements to signal that the text belongs to a culture other than the culture of the translation receptor, are only filtered by the translator, who can leave them unchanged in the translation text or adapt them to the culture of the source language (Yumkruz A., 2022: 130–141). The translator's background knowledge and familiarity with the real situation described in the text are the most important elements of translation competence. Analysis of translations shows that many translation errors are based on translators' ignorance or misunderstanding of the objective realia described in the source text. Translation is one of the forms in which these contacts are made. Thus, the dissemination of background information also occurs through translation, «especially through the translation of fiction and, as well as drama, where material details of material and social life, the way people address each other, etc. play an important role in depicting the background of the action». Such details have names in the original and require translation. The question of the role of background knowledge in communication, and translation in particular, seems to be addressed unambiguously in most works on translation theory. The scientists completely support the idea of the importance of having relevant background knowledge for participants in the communication process, including interlanguage (Oguy O., 2003; Rebriy O., 2019; Zorivchak R., 1989; Karaban V., 2003; Yumkruz A., 2022: 130–141; Bekh P., 2005; Nir R., 1984; Naida E., 1975).

Considering the translation process within the framework of the communicative model, it should be emphasised that the translator always acts in a dual capacity: as a recipient of the source text in the act of primary communication and as a sender of the translation text perceived by the recipient of the translation text in the act of secondary communication.

Speaking about the basic requirements a translator must meet in the process of interlingual communication, I. V. Korunets writes that a text translation requires two conditions that are essential and insufficient in themselves: knowledge of the language and knowledge of the civilisation with which the language is associated (i. e. knowledge of the life, culture and history of the people for whom this language is an expression means) (Korunets I., 2008: 74–79). To translate well, it is not enough to learn the language; one must also learn the culture of that language.

It is important to emphasise that this requirement is put forward to the translator at the stage of perception of the source text. Acting as a recipient of the original in the primary communicative act, the translator seeks to extract the information contained in it as fully as possible, for which he or she must have not only sufficient knowledge of the source language, but also extralinguistic knowledge possessed by native speakers of the source language.

In the context of this study, it is important to emphasise the importance of having certain background knowledge, especially that of the translator. Thus, the need to make pragmatic adaptation in the translation process is undeniable. Any utterance is created with the aim of achieving some kind of communicative effect, so the pragmatic potential is the most important part. When creating a translation text, a translator either tries to preserve the pragmatic potential of the original or tries to ensure this text has a different pragmatic potential, to some extent independent of the pragmatics of the source text. In either case, the translator has to resort to pragmatic adaptation in translation. Thus, realias form the basis of background knowledge. From the point of view of translation theory, realias appear as lexical units to name objects and phenomena characteristic of the life (everyday life, culture, state system) of one people and are not found in other languages. As carriers of national and historical colour, they usually do not have exact equivalents in other languages. An essential prerequisite for the correct conveyance of realias in translation is the translator's knowledge of realias and a correct understanding of them. In addition to language knowledge, the translator must have sufficient extra-linguistic (background) knowledge, the information contained in realia stems from the existing realia and the essence of the problem of conveying this information is to find the means to ensure the correctness of the transmission of this information, i. e. the subject and emotional meaning of realia expressed by means of the source language, which cannot be changed in the process of translation, while the form may change (Zorivchak R., 1989: 89).

In modern translation practice, overcoming the difficulties associated with cultural and historical differences between two language groups does not cause serious problems. The realias denoting objects and phenomena of the culture of native speakers of a given language are usually referred to as non-

equivalent vocabulary in translation studies. The term «equivalent-free vocabulary» refers not only to realias, but it also indicates a characteristic feature of such lexical items: they usually do not have regular correspondences in other languages. Nevertheless, the existence of such non-equivalent units does not mean that their meanings cannot be conveyed in translation. Translation practice has developed a number of ways in which the meanings of realias can be adequately conveyed. According to R. Zorivchak, the concept of «translation of realias» is twice conditional: a realia is usually untranslatable (in the dictionary), and it is usually conveyed (in the context) not by translation. There are two main difficulties in conveying realias in translation: 1) the absence of a correspondence (equivalent, analogue) in the recipient language due to the lack of an object (referent) denoted by the realia in the native speaker's language. 2) the need, along with the subject meaning (semantics) of the realia, to convey its peculiarity – its national and historical colouring (Zorivchak R., 1989: 89–100).

Despite the existing difficulties, the meaning and, if necessary, the realias colouring can be conveyed in translation to some extent. The scholars offer various classifications of ways to convey realias. Based on the above studies, we have found that realias denote objects and phenomena characteristic of a particular language community and can be identified by comparing lexical items of two languages. The connection of these objects and phenomena with the people and the historical time period is clearly traced. The realias studied are also characterised by local colouring and are able to reproduce the national life peculiarities and everyday life of the language group. In addition, realias also differ from other lexical items by their common usage in different speech styles, unambiguity and non-equivalence. Within the framework of any literary text, realias with a pronounced national and cultural marking perform various functions making these lexical units multifunctional. Quite obvious functions of realias are also the functions of reproducing national and historical colouring, the symbolic function and the function of aestheticising everyday details to be used to immerse the reader in the national atmosphere of the events. An adequate translation standard means a translation in which the source and target texts are as equivalent as possible. To translate a source text into any other language, a translator needs to be familiar with such concepts as translation methods, techniques. They are the main categories to be used to achieve the most accurate transmission of the source text into the target language.

An analysis of translation studies devoted to this issue allows us to speak with confidence about the need to preserve the national and historical flavour of the original in translation. Elements of the original that are the most striking indicators of the national and historical originality of works, i. e. the so-called realias, require special attention and often present great difficulties in translation. In the process of translation, the text is changed depending on the characteristics of the new recipient, adapting the knowledge, mentality, national and cultural characteristics (Korunets I. 2008: 19–25). This adaptation results in a change in the information contained in the source text. One of the most important principles of translation is the use of the functional significance of a realia in the source text, depending on which the translator decides the way to translate the realia or its complete elimination if it plays a significant role.

Considering translation as a creative process that involves contact between two languages and cultures, it is important to remember that a translator, like a sender and a receiver, is an amateur linguistic personality, a full-fledged participant in interlingual communication, who can be a representative of either the cultural and linguistic community of the source language or the target language. Considering this fact, it can be fairly assumed that the translator has a certain influence on the translator's strategy in general, and in particular on his / her strategy when translating realias. Any two languages are different in their historical, geographical, and cultural backgrounds have elements in their language systems that cannot be compared. The language of a nation reveals its identity and individuality. In this regard, researchers speak of a linguistic picture of the world, which is formed by a person through thinking in a particular language (Oguy O., 2003; 2019; Zorivchak R., 1989; Karaban V., 2003; Yumkruz A., 2022: 130–141; Baker M., 1992; Toury G., 1980).

Works on translation theory point out that when considering translation as an act of bilingual communication, one should take into account the differences in the cultures of its participants, since the languages that come into contact in translation are themselves carriers of national cultures. The communicators involved in interlingual communication speak different languages, but they also have different background knowledge, different social and historical experiences, and belong to different cultures. This is typical of the opinion of the famous American translation theorist E. Naida. One of the features of E. Naida's concept is its focus on cultural and ethnic aspects of translation. In order to have the desired pragmatic impact, one should take

into account the socio-cultural differences reflected in the language and the peculiarities of the receptors' background knowledge, which determine the correct interpretation and evaluation of the transmitted information. In his works, E. Naida suggests that the necessary impact on receptors of this kind can only be ensured if the translation text does not contain cultural facts unfamiliar to the target language or images or associations based on these facts. This implies the need for significant cultural adaptation of the text during translation (Naida E., 1975). The problem of compensating for the loss of information that may occur during the transfer of realias (as lexical items denoting phenomena absent in the culture of the target language) is closely related to one of the most important categories of pragmatics – the pragmatic factor, which reflects the totality of background knowledge and the different socio-cultural experience of native speakers.

Thus, the content of background information covers, first of all, specific facts of the history and state structure of the national community, peculiarities of its geographical environment, characteristic objects of material culture of the past and present, etc. – that is, everything that is traditionally called realias in translation theory. The translator's background knowledge and familiarity with the real situation described in the text are the most important elements of translation competence; many translation errors are based on translators' ignorance or misunderstanding of the objective realia described in the source text.

It is important to emphasise that this requirement is put forward to the translator at the perception stage of the source text. Acting as a recipient of the original in the primary communicative act, a translator seeks to extract the information contained in it as fully as possible, for which he or she must have not only sufficient knowledge of the source language, but also the extralinguistic knowledge possessed by native speakers of the source language. G. Touri believes that the ability to correctly convey the designation of objects and phenomena referred to in the original and the images associated with them, especially presupposes that the translator, as the recipient of the translation text, has certain knowledge of the realia depicted in the work being translated (Touri G., 1980: 20–22).

Translation is one of the forms in which these contacts are made. Thus, the dissemination of background information also occurs through translation, «especially through the translation of fiction and, as well as drama, where material details of material and social life, the way people address each other, etc. play an important role in depicting the background of the action». Such details have names in the original and require translation. The question on the role of background knowledge in communication, and translation in particular, seems to be addressed unambiguously in most works on translation theory. The scientists fully support the idea of the importance of having relevant background knowledge for participants in the communication process, including interlanguage (Oguy O., 2003; Rebriy O., 2019; Zorivchak R., 1989; Karaban V., 2003; Bekh P., 2005).

Conclusions and suggestions. In the context of this study, it is important to emphasise the importance of having certain background knowledge, especially that of a translator. Thus, the need to make pragmatic adaptation in the translation process is undeniable. Any utterance is created with the aim of achieving some kind of communicative effect, so the pragmatic potential is the most important part. When creating a translation text, a translator either tries to preserve the pragmatic potential of the original or tries to ensure that this text has a different pragmatic potential, to some extent independent of the pragmatics of the source text. Thus, realias form the basis of background knowledge. From the point of view of translation theory, realias appear as lexical units to name objects and phenomena characteristic of the life (everyday life, culture, state system) of one people and are not found in other languages. As carriers of national and historical colour, they usually do not have exact equivalents in other languages. Due to the specific nature of the studied lexical items, it seems necessary to emphasise that an integral part of the translator's overall strategy when translating realias is cultural and pragmatic adaptation, involving the inclusion of additional explanatory elements in the translation text, the exclusion of elements that are redundant from the point of view of the foreign language recipient, as well as a number of semantic transformations.

Thus, translation theory has developed a number of systematic approaches to the problem of translating realias and classifications of techniques for conveying the meanings of these lexical units. It should be noted although translators have faced the problem of conveying national realias for a long time, and there is already a large set of translation methods and techniques for conveying such lexical units, it cannot be considered completely resolved, since not every case has a ready-made translation equivalent. The study of such a translation issue as the possibility of conveying realias is of considerable theoretical interest as part of the more general question of the possibility of faithfully reproducing the national and historical originality of the original by means of the language into which the translation is made.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бех П. О. Неперекладне в перекладі (Про книгу Р. П. Зорівчак «Реалія і переклад»). *Теорія і практика перекладу*. Київ: Вища школа, 1992. Вип. 18. 196 с.

2. Гаврилів Т. Текст між культурами = Texts between cultures: Essays on Translation: Перекладознавчі студії. Київ: Критика, 2005. 200 с.

3. Гаман І. В. Національно-специфічна реалія як складова картина світу. *Проблеми та перспективи формування національної гуманітарно-технічної еліти*: Зб. наук. праць. Харків, 2019. Вип. 23 – 24. С. 85–87.

4. Демецька В. В. Теорія адаптації в перекладі : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня доктора філол. наук : спец. 10.02.16 «Перекладознавство». Київ, 2008. 36 с.

5. Засєкін С. В. Психолінгвістичні універсалії перекладу художнього тексту : монографія. Луцьк : ВНУ ім. Лесі Українки, 2012. 275 с.

6. Зорівчак Р. П. Реалія і переклад (на матеріалі англомовних перекладів української прози). Львів, 1989. 216 с.

7. Карабан В. І., Мейс Дж. Переклад з української мови на англійську: навч. посібник-довідник. Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2003. 608 с.

8. Корунець І. В. Вступ до перекладознавства. навч. посіб. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2008. 512 .

9. Огуй О. Д., Івасюк О. Я. Лінгвістика та перекладознавство : мовні концепції та способи перекладу. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького ун-ту*. Вип. 165–166 : Германська філологія. Чернівці, 2003. С. 145–157.

10. Ребрій О. В. Сучасні концепції творчості у перекладі : монографія. Харків: ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна, 2019. 376 с.

11. Селіванова О. О. Лінгвістична енциклопедія. Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2010. 844 с.

12. Юмрукуз А., Ірхіна Ю. Відтворення лінгвокультурних реалій в українських перекладах англомовних алюзій. *Науковий вісник ПНПУ ім. К. Д. Ушинського*. 2022. № 34. С. 130–141 https://www.lingstud.od.ua/archive/2022/34/11.pdf

13. Baker M. In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation. London and New York, 1992. 304 p.

14. Neubert A. Kinds of lexical meaning. *Zeitschrift fur Anglistik und Amerikanistik*. Leipzig, 1999. Heft 3. PP. 241–245.

15. Nida E. A. Language Structure and Translation. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1975. 230 p.

16. Nir R. Linguistic and sociolinguistic problems in the translation of imported TV films in Israel. International Journal of the Sociology of Language. 1984. № 48. P. 81–97.

17. Toury G. In Search of a Theory of Translation. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University, 1980. 159 p.

REFERENCES

1. Bekh P. O. (1992). Neperekladne v perekladi (Pro knyhu R. P. Zorivchak «Realiia i pereklad»). Teoriia i praktyka perekladu. *[The Untranslatable in Translation (On R. P. Zorivchak's book Reality and Translation. Theory and practice of translation]*. Kyiv: Vyshcha schkola, Vyp. 18. [in Ukrainian].

2. Havryliv T. (2005). Tekst mizh kulturamy = Texts between cultures: Essays on Translation: Perekladoznavchi studii. [*Text between cultures = Texts between cultures: Essays on Translation: Essays on Translation*]. Kyiv: Krytyka. [in Ukrainian].

3. Haman I. V. (2019). Natsionalno-spetsyfichna realiia yak skladova kartyna svitu. [*Nationally-specific reality as a background of the world*]. *Collection of scientific works. Kharkiv*. Issue 23–24. Pp. 85–87 [in Ukrainian].

4. Demetska V. V. (2008). Teoriia adaptatsii v perekladi: avtoref. dys. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia doktora filol. nauk [*Theory of adaptation in translation: dissertation on gaining the scientific degree of Doctor of Philology*]. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].

5. Zasekin S. V. (2012). Psykholinhvistychni universalii perekladu khudozhnoho tekstu [*Psycholinguistic universals of literary text translation*]. Lutsk : VNU named after L. Ukrainki. [in Ukrainian].

6. Zorivchak R. P. (1989). Realiia i pereklad (na materiali anhlomovnykh perekladiv ukrainskoi prozy) [*Realiia and Translation (based on English translations of Ukrainian prose)]*. Lviv. [in Ukrainian].

7. Karaban V. I. (2003). Pereklad z ukrainskoi movy na anhliisku: navch. posibnyk-dovidnyk [*Translation from Ukrainian into English: a study guide*]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyga. [in Ukrainian].

8. Korunets I. V. (2008). Vstup do perekladoznavstva [Introduction to Translation Studies]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyga. [in Ukrainian].

9. Ogui O. D., Ivasiuk O. Ya. (2003). Linhvistyka ta perekladoznavstvo : movni kontseptsii ta sposoby perekladu [*Linguistics and translation studies: language concepts and methods of translation*]. *Scientific bulletin of Chernivtsy University Issue 165 – 166: German Philology: Chernivtsy.* [in Ukrainian].

10. Rebriy O. V. (2019). Sychacni kontseptsii tvorchosti u perekladi [*Modern concepts of creativity in translation*]. Kharkiv: KNU named after V. N. Karazin. [in Ukrainian].

11. Selivanova O. O. (2010). Lingvistychna entsyklopediia [Linguistic encyclopedia]. Poltava: Dovkillia-K. [in Ukrainian].

12. Yumrukuz A., Irkhina Yu. (2022). Vidtvorennia linhvokulturnykh realii v ukrainskykh perekladakh anhlomovnykh aliuzii. [*Rendering linguistic and cultural realia in Ukrainian translation of English allusions*]. Scientific bulletin of PNPU named after K. D. Ushynskyi. Issue 34. https://www.lingstud.od.ua/archive/2022/34/11.pdf

13. Baker M. (1992). In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation. London and New York.

14. Neubert A. (1999). Kinds of lexical meaning. *Zeitschrift fur Anglistik und Amerikanistik*. Leipzig. Heft 3.

15. Nida E. A. (1975). Language Structure and Translation. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press.

16. Nir R. (1984). Linguistic and sociolinguistic problems in the translation of imported TV films in Israel. International Journal of the Sociology of Language. № 48.

17. Toury G. (1980). In Search of a Theory of Translation. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University.